#### Memorandum

Date:

January 8, 2010

To:

Southern Division

From:

DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

Santa Fe Springs

File No.:

550.13318.12507

Subject:

HPM 22.1 COMMAND INSPECTION, CHAPTER 6 - COMMAND

OVERTIME AND GRANT MANAGEMENT

The Santa Fe Spring Area has completed the inspections as contained in HPM, Chapter 6. Attached are the completed checklists for Chapter 6, Command Overtime and Grant Management, as requested in the Memorandum from Southern Division dated January 15, 2009. Currently, there are no additional action items discovered in this inspection. Please direct any questions to Sergeant Bob Headden.

D. J. MINOR, Captain

Commander

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

# COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Overtime

Command:	Division:	Number:
Santa Fe Springs	Southern	550
Evaluated by:	•	Date:
R. Headden, Sergeant. #10267		01/08/2010
Assisted by:		Date:
R.L. VELASCO,	LIENTENANT	01/07/2010

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.								
TVDE OF	INSPECTION		Lead Inspe	etor's Signatu	re:			
TYPE OF	INSPECTION			1	/ .			
☐ Division Level ☐ Command Level				1 tob A 10 1 (1 +102 )				
	cutive Office Level	☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection	) Yell		feor	THE STATE OF THE S	Date:	
Fol	low-up Required:	☐ Follow-up Inspection	Commande	er's Signature:			Date.	
		☐ Follow-up Hispection						
	Yes 🔀 No		1/2/10					
For ap	olicable policies, refer	to HPM 11.1, Chapter 6,	,	1 1				
	0.71, Chapters 2, 8, a							
Chapte	er 2, and HPM 10.3, C	hapters 24 and 28.						
Note: If	a "No" or "N/A" box is c	hecked, the "Remarks" section	shall be ut	ilized for ex	planation.			
1.	Is the hiring company/a		<b></b>			Remarks:		1
	overtime being held res	ponsible for paying a		☐ No	□ N/A	romano.		
	minimum of four hours							
	uniformed employee, re	egardless of length of						
	service/detail?							
2.		ours overtime being allocated	_			Remarks:		
		l employee(s) if cancellation		☐ No	□ N/A	remand.		3
		hours or less prior to the						
		e assigned CHP uniformed						
	employee(s) cannot be	notified of such cancellation?						
3.	Are reimbursable speci	al project codes being used	<b>5</b>			Remarks:		
	for all overtime associa	ted with reimbursable special		☐ No	□ N/A	rtomanto.		
	projects?							
4.		iring nonuniformed personnel				Remarks:		
	overtime hours are not	reflected on the Report of		☐ No	□ N/A	Tromano.		
		mbursable Special Projects?						
5.	Is the commander ensu	iring non-reimbursable	<b>M</b>			Remarks:		
		aimed for an employee, other		☐ No	□ N/A			
	than Bargaining Unit 7,							
		or hours worked during their						
	regular work shift time?							
6.		in the "Notes" section of the	N V		□ NI/A	Remarks:		
		ecord, for overtime worked on		☐ No	□ N/A			
	a regular day off?							
7.		ort of Court Appearance -	N Vac		□ N/A	Remarks:		
	Civil Action, completed when overtime is associated	for each officer or sergeant		☐ No				
	when overtime is assoc	dated for civil court?	1		1			

2 of 2

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

### COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Overtime

8.	employee's lunch period or indicate "None" if the employee worked through their lunch break?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
9.	Did the supervisor sign the CHP 415s approving the overtime?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
10.	Are claimed overtime meals related to overtime worked within 50 miles of the employee's headquarters?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	If overtime is incurred by a peer support counselor, is the name of the employee to whom support was provided excluded from the CHP 415 of the counselor?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: None incurred
12.	Is the "Notes" section on side two of the CHP 415 used to explain any overtime listed on side one of the CHP 415?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
13.	Are employee's Compensated Time Off hours maintained within reasonable balances?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
14.	Is the commander ensuring employees are not incurring overtime due to working over the allotted number of hours for any given Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) period?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
15.	Is the commander ensuring uniformed employees are not working voluntary overtime which results in them working more than 16.5 hours in a 24 hour period?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
16.	Do the CHP 415 total overtime hours agree with the Monthly Attendance Report (MAR)?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
17.	Are the MARs retained for at least three years and contain the commander's signature?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

## COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Grant Management

Command: Santa Fe Springs	Division: Southern	Number: 550		
Evaluated by: R. Headden, Sgt. #10267		Date: 01/08/2010		
Assisted by:		Date:		
R.L. VELASCO, LIEUTENANT		01/07/2010		

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.							
TYPE OF INSPECTION	Lead Inspe	Lead Inspector's Signature:					
☐ Division Level ☐ Command Level	1/ 4/1	1/ Sich of Neural 1 = 102,00					
☐ Executive Office Level ☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection	/ //	week the transfer of the trans					
Follow-up Required:	Command	r's Signature:		Date:			
☐ Follow-up Inspection		1. 11 /	1	1/12/10			
☐ Yes	h	July 1	V-	11/1/2/10			
For applicable policy, refer to: GO 40.6							
Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section	n shall he ut	ilized for ex	nlanation				
If the commander became aware that another	Shall be at	IIIZOG TOT OF	planation				
agency or organization is proposing or has submitted	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: None incurred.			
a grant application to a funding agency other than the							
Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) that appears to focus							
on traffic safety goals clearly within the jurisdiction of							
the Department, did the commander notify the appropriate assistant commissioner?							
Has OTS grant funding, through the Highway Safety							
Plan, been sought for traffic safety-related activities	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Not needed.			
for the purpose of conducting inventories, need and							
engineering studies, system development or program	1						
implementations?							
<ol> <li>Has the command sought grant funding to assist with the expenses associated with the priority programs</li> </ol>	│	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:			
identified by the National Highway Traffic Safety							
Administration?							
Has the commander ensured grant funds are not							
being reallocated to fund other programs or used for		☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:			
non-reimbursable overtime expenditures?							
5. Are concept papers regarding grant funding submitted through channels to Grants Management	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: None incurred.			
Unit (GMU)?							
6. Was GMU contacted to determine the current							
personnel billing rates used for grant projects when	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: None incurred.			
preparing concept paper budgets?							

2 of 3

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

#### COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6

Command Grant Management

7. Is supporting documentation of consent and acceptance (of the work, goods, or services provided by the state on behalf of a local government agency as required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1250) being submitted to OTS for all grant projects coded as "for local benefit"?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: None incurred.
8. Were all copies of the grant project agreements, revisions, and claim invoices signed by the Project Director, or designated alternate?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
9. Were all inquiries or correspondence concerning the availability of grant funds or other contacts with grant funding agencies coordinated/processed through GMU?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
10. Are all expenditures of grant funds approved by GMU prior to entering into any obligations, with the exception of personnel costs?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
11. Are quarterly progress reports forwarded though channels to GMU in accordance with the instructions contained in the associated project MOU?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
12. Are all requirements of the grant agreement and MOU being met?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
13. Is a final project report being prepared in accordance with the funding agency and departmental requirements upon the termination of the grant project?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
14. Does every invoice associated with a grant funded project contain the project number and name?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
15. Are all purchases of grant-funded equipment acquired under an OTS grant exceeding a unit cost of \$5,000 being documented on an Equipment Report, Form OTS-25?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: None incurred.
16. Has grant funded equipment been inspected to ensure it is being utilized in accordance with the respective grant agreement?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
 <ul> <li>17. Are applications for federal funds in accordance with Government Code Section 13326 including obtaining approval from the Department of Finance and/or the Governor's office prior to submission to the appropriate federal authority?</li> <li>This would include any of the following: <ul> <li>Applications for federal funds which are not included in the budget approved by the Governor.</li> <li>Applications for federal funds which exceed the amount specified in the budget.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: None incurred.

3 of 3

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

# COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Grant Management

18.	Is a federal Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, filed with the State Clearinghouse for all approved unbudgeted grant requests received by the Department of Finance?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: None incurred.
19.	Has any request for unanticipated federal funds met the criteria for legislative notification set forth in Control Section 28.00 of the annual Budget Act?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: None incurred.
	Are grant funds being used for their intended purpose?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
21.	Are grant applications related to the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) being routed through the Commercial Vehicle Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Managed at Division level.
	Are grant applications related to the Homeland Security Grant Program being routed through the Emergency Operations Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: None incurred.
Questi	ons 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Managemen	it Unit			
23.	Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program?	☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
24	Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive Assistants?	☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
25	Did OMI waste source of the Dark Orant Associated	1		1	
	Did GMU route copies of the Draft Grant Agreement using the CHP Form 60, Staff Summary Statement, to all commands with responsibility for or that have an interest in the project?	☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: